HATTIE ELIZABETH LEWIS MEMORIAL

ESSAYS IN APPLIED CHRISTIANITY

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS AND THE HAGUE

By JAMES ARMSTRONG SCOTT

First Prize, 1918

HN31
.H36
1918

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 12 1956
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HN31
.H36
1918

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 26 1919
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HATTIE ELIZABETH LEWIS MEMORIAL

ESSAYS IN APPLIED CHRISTIANITY

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS AND THE HAGUE

By JAMES ARMSTRONG SCOTT

First Prize, 1918

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Press of the
Department of Journalism
University of Kansas
Lawrence
1918

PREFATORY NOTE

The Hattie Elizabeth Lewis Memorial

This Memorial was established in the University of Kansas in 1911, in memory of Hattie Elizabeth Lewis, a former student of the University. It was founded by Professor George Edward Patrick of Washington, D. C., and is maintained out of funds put into the hands of the Chancellor of the University a few months before Professor Patrick's death, which occurred March 22, 1916. Professor Patrick was a member of the faculty of the University of Kansas from 1874 to 1883. He and Miss Lewis were married in 1883. Mrs. Patrick died in 1909.

The Memorial takes the form of an annual competition in essay writing, open to all students of the University of Kansas. The general theme of the essays submitted in this competition is "The Application of the Teachings of Jesus to the Practical Affairs and Relations of Life, Individual, Social, Industrial, Commercial, or Political;" but each essay must deal with a single definite subject, or a single phase of life. In the competition for the year 1917-18, the University Committee in charge of the competition itself prescribed the particular phase of the general theme to which contestants were to be confined: "The Application of the Teachings of Jesus to International Relations." Each essay is required to be not less than 5,000 nor more than 10,000 words in length.

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS AND THE HAGUE

BY

JAMES ARMSTRONG SCOTT

CONTENTS

I. The record of the Hague 12

A. Character of conferences 12

1. Composition 12
a. Origin 12
b. Participating nations 12
c. Characteristics of delegates 12

2. Machinery for work 13
a. Commissions 13
b. Method of procedure 13

B. Work of conferences 14

1. Actual accomplishments 14

a. Codification of international law: laws of civilized warfare 14
b. Arrangements for prevention of war 14

1. In first conference 14
a. Indorsement of principle of arbitration: good offices 14
b. Establishment of Commissions of Inquiry 14
c. Establishment of Court of International Arbitration 15

2. In second conference 15
a. Restraint from use of armed force in collection of debts 15
b. Establishment of International Court of Appeal in Prize Cases 15

2. "Attempts" or "voeux" 16
a. List of 16

1. Limitation of armaments 16
2. Immunity of private property on sea during war 16

3. Real "permanent court" of arbitration 17
4. Principle of obligatory arbitration.... 17
b. Value of 17
C. Influence of conferences 18
1. Practical 18
a. Arbitration treaties 18
b. Arbitration cases 18
2. Spiritual 18
a. Educative influence on public 18
b. Educative influence on methods of peace workers 18
II. Christ's teachings on problems of war..... 18
A. Interpretations of extremists 19
1. Arguments for 19
a. Militarists 19
b. Pacifists 19
2. Criticism of 19
B. Christ as an evolutionist 20
1. Quotations from teachings 21
2. Agreement with doctrines enunciated at the Hague 22
III. Evolutionary stage of contemporary world politics.. 23
A. Factors for war 23
1. Psychological 23
a. Appeals to feeling 23
1. To national ambition for conquest.... 23
2. To fear of other peoples 24
b. Intellectual appeal: arguments of militarists 24
2. Political 24
a. System of armed states 24
b. Secret diplomacy 25
B. Factors for peace 25
1. Evolutionary movement from war 25

a. Causes of 25
1. Economic 25
2. Moral 26
b. Law of social acceleration 27
2. Contemporary forces for peace..... 27
a. Peace sentiment 27
b. Democracy: public diplomacy..... 28
c. Economic organization of world 28

IV. The program for the Christian nations..... 30

A. Creation of machinery for peace: League to Enforce Peace 30
1. Necessity of overthrowing doctrine of sovereignty as preliminary 30
2. Proposal for League to Enforce Peace: provisions of 30
3. Opinions of world politicians on plan..... 32
4. Criticism of League 33
a. Defects 33
b. Advantages 34

B. Strengthening of will to peace: education... 35

THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS AND THE HAGUE

The real issue over which the world war rages is reducible, in the final analysis, to the question of international government. Two antagonistic theories of the state are grappling in a struggle upon the outcome of which hangs the fate of future civilization. On the one side battle the champions of a doctrine of the sovereignty and independence of nations which would force upon the world a permanent condition of international anarchy. On the other side battle the champions of the introduction of law into the relations of states. The inviolability of the treaty, the latter maintain, must be upheld at all hazards. The loose union of nations, as it has thus far been perfected at the Hague, must be preserved. The articles of confederation there drawn up may not be set aside at any nation's whim. Modern means of travel and communication have caused the civilized globe to shrink so greatly that we must accept the fact that a world divided against itself cannot stand. The society of nations is a union to the members of which the right of secession is denied. Upon the side of law, America has enlisted all her strength. We are warring for the reign of reason in the acts of states.

And while we fight, firm in the belief that our cause will ultimately be triumphant, it is our duty to prepare for the cessation of hostilities. In the reconstruction days that are to follow the declaration of peace, we have before us the responsibility of helping to lay the foundation for a political order from which the probability of a recurrence of the present cataclysm will be excluded. A return to the *status quo ante bellum* would be suicidal. On that point, the world is fully agreed. The problem which today tasks the ingenuity of our ablest statesmen is the formulation of a means of strengthening the organization of the powers that the future may be made warproof. An adequate treatment of the problem should begin with the determination of the degree of international organization which we have already attained and for which we are fighting. As this organization centers around the Hague, a brief resumé of the work

done there is first in order. Following that, an attempt will be made to ascertain what Christ taught on the subject, and, after a critical evaluation of the conflicting interpretations placed upon those teachings, to select the one most consonant with His character. In the third section, as a preliminary to making a practical application of the teachings, an analysis of contemporary world politics, pointing out the political facts which condition our solution, will be made. Then, keeping in mind the specific needs of the twentieth century, we shall conclude with a suggestion agreeing with the doctrines of Christ.

I

It was on August 14, 1898, that Nicholas II, of Russia, issued his famous Rescript, which invited a number of civilized nations to a conference for the discussion of means of preserving the general peace, and, more particularly, of placing some limitation on the rapid increase of armaments.[1] Twenty-six powers accepted the invitation; and their representatives assembled at the Hague on May, 1899.[2] Elated by the attainments of the first, many prominent men labored for the early convocation of a second conference; and, in 1904, the Interparliamentary Union, in session at St. Louis, adopted a resolution requesting President Roosevelt to call it. The president complied with this petition; but, at the request of the Russian representative, later relinquished the honor of convoking it to the Czar.[3] At the second conference, which met June 15, 1907, sat representatives of forty-four nations. Like the preceding one, it was a pronounced success.

Not a small portion of the success of both assemblies may be attributed to their personnel. The delegates were not utopian philosophers but conservative statesmen. No convention felt to be too far ahead of public opinion was inaugurated. Their very moderation has done as much for their cause as the radicalism of other peace meetings have injured it. The fact that the two conferences were initiated by governments of weighty influence, in addition to the fact that they were composed of men who possessed a thorough insight into the public mind, presaged the cre-

1. Choate, The Two Hague Conferences, p. 5.
   Hull, The Two Hague Conferences, p. 3.
2. Choate, op. cit., p. 7.
3. Hull, op. cit., p. 4ff.

ation of a powerful agency for peace.

Fully in keeping with the character of the delegates was the organization for business.[4] The conference of 1899 was divided into three principal commissions. They were the commission in charge of armaments and the use of new implements of war, the commission in charge of the laws and customs of warfare, and the commission in charge of arbitration and other means of preventing war. Each of the first two was divided into two subcommissions which separately worked on military and naval matters. In the third commission was appointed a commission of examination to report upon plans of arbitration. The procedure was as follows. In each subcommission, the Russian delegate would explain the proposal of his government. The other members of the subcommission would reject, amend, or accept this proposal. The amended report would be discussed in a "reunion" of the commission concerned, and a final report would be presented for further consideration in a plenary session of the conference. Absolute unanimity was prerequisite to the passage of every act.[5] The last step was the presentation of the plan to the signatory governments for ratification. The procedure of the second conference was identical with that of the first, and its organization was upon the same basis.[6] It must be borne in mind that to the sane methods of the delegates and the political prestige of the sponsors of the conferences is due the weight attached to their work. The Hague agreements are entitled to a far higher rating than the preposterous resolutions which emanate from the average convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

In estimating the value of the Hague's contribution to the movement for judicial methods of settling disputes between nations, it is customary to distinguish two classes of results.[7] In the first place, several important achievements were made there. In the second place, there were principles of fundamental importance, which, though not unanimously accepted as then workable, were nevertheless pointed out to the govern-

4. Ibid., p. 28ff.
5. Choate, op. cit., p. 37.
6. Ibid., p. 31.
7. The distinction follows Hull, op. cit., p. 449.

ments of the world as the next step towards the establishment of stable peace. The latter are termed "voeux" or "attempts".

What many regard as the most important piece of work done at the Hague is the codification of the laws and customs of civilized warfare.[8] Up to 1899, there had been no *written* code governing the fights of nations. Now an effort was made to restrict the barbarity of their practices. It is, of course, easy to overemphasize this phase of the work because such codification does not really make for peace, and because the sad experience of the present crisis teaches us the impossibility of civilizing war. It is no less futile to try to aid the cause of peace by such regulations than it is to try to advance the cause of civilization by the conversion of savages to the use of knives and forks in eating their victims. What value such a measure has lies in the fact that it implies the recognition of law. It is an outright refutation of the philosophy of the state which defines sovereignty as the right to act in disregard of rules. But the Hague conferees failed in their attempt to alleviate the miseries of the battle-field by conventions relating to fighting in the air—which was prohibited until the end of the third conference[9]—fighting on sea, bombarding of ports,[10] the rights and duties of neutrals, and other details of war.

Much more important in its final results on the peace question was the impetus the Hague gave to the cause of international arbitration. In the clearest language, the powers were committed to arbitration as the most efficacious mode of adjusting differences. The conventions for the pacific settlement of disputes have been hailed as the Magna Charta of international law. No longer, they explicitly stated, were quarreling nations to regard the proffer of mediation and good offices by a power stranger to their dispute as an unfriendly act.[11] More than that, the assembly contrived a special procedure for mediation by a neutral power.[12] Again, the creation of International Commissions of Inquiry reflected the growing sentiment in favor of a thorough investigation before the declaration of hostilities. These com-

8. Choate, op. cit.. p. 12ff.
9. Ibid., p. 13.
10. See Scott, The Hague Peace Conferences, Chap. XII.
11. See Appendix, I.
12. Scott, Hague Conventions and Declarations, p. 45.

missions make no decisions.[13] They merely ascertain the facts concerning the matter in question and present them to the contending parties. In many cases, no more is necessary to prevent war.

But mediation by neutral powers is only advisory, and the Commissions of Inquiry render no verdict. To bring into existence an institution competent to settle judicially cases presented to it, the first conference created a "Permanent Court of Arbitration".[14] According to its plan, each nation party to the agreement elects not more than four persons of recognized ability in international law to act as judges for a term of six years. On the rise of a controversy, the disputants select their judges from the list thus made. The value of the court is derived not only from the fact that it is a preventive of war, but also from the contribution its decisions make to the advance of international law.[15]

The accomplishments of 1907 are of greater import-ance than those of 1899 because of the greater number of signatory nations.[16] In the latter conference, a real triumph for obligatory arbitration was scored in the stipulation that no power should have recourse to the compulsory collection of debts from a government until arbitration had been given a chance.[17] The agreement is automatically nullified if the debtor country refuses to submit to arbitration, rejects the award, or resorts to some subterfuge to prevent the tribunal from arriving at a decision. The provision is a strong protection to the weaker nations. A second triumph for obligatory arbitration was the establishment of the first truly permanent court of arbitration in history,[18] the International Court of Appeal in Prize Cases. This court stands as the sole example of a judicial body to which nations are obliged to take their differences. It is composed of fifteen judges, who are advised by a board of naval representatives. Each of the eight great powers has a judge all of the time, i. e., each appoints one for a term of twelve years. Each of the other nations appoints a judge to serve for a term of from

13. Ibid., p. 46.
14. Choate, op. cit., p. 32. Scott, Hague Conventions and Declarations, p. 58ff.
15. See Appendix, II.
16. Choate, op. cit., p. 59.
17. See appendix, III.
18. Choate, op. cit., p. 65.

one to eleven years, according to the general standing of the country represented. To this court is entrusted the disposition of prizes captured on the high seas.

Such, in brief, are the actual accomplishments. Aside from the reduction of the customs of war to paper, we see an attempt to devise means for the preservation of the general peace. The institutions and plans here adopted were all conceived in answer to the urgent need for some way of maintaining pacific relations among nations. The other sort of work, though not so palpably conducive to this end, was equally valuable. The "attempts", which also appeared in the final report, paved the way for future progress by showing the world the road it must take if it would ever arrive at the goal of perpetual peace.[19] Let us look at the more important of them.

To begin with, the Hague Conference did not achieve the purpose for which it was called. Despite the fact that the question of a limitation of armaments was the object of earnest consideration, it met with too strong opposition from several powers, notably Germany, for the discussion to terminate in any degree of unanimity.[20] Still, it was the consensus of opinion among the majority of members that a fundamental prerequisite to the attainment of lasting peace was the restriction of the rapidly growing enginery of war, which, as early as 1899, gave promise of the havoc it would one day play. In the same way, by a vote of twenty-one to eleven, the conference gave its sanction to the American proposal for the immunity of private property on the high seas during a state of war.

Yet by far the most magnificent failure of either conference was the attempt to establish a really permanent court of arbitration, competent to pass on all disputes.[21] To be sure, a so-called permanent court had been created in 1899. But in that case "permanent" court was a misnomer. The thing actually permanent in it was the *list* of possible judges.[22] The body held no regular sessions; the presentation of a controversy was necessary to call it into existence; and it was dissolved upon arriving

19. Hull, op. cit., p. 449.
20. Choate, op. cit., p. 80.
21. Ibid., p. 77.
22. Scott, Hague Peace Conferences, p. 42.

at a verdict. The proposal for a truly permanent court of such wide scope, therefore, by such a body of men was *per se* significant of the progressive internationalization of public opinion. The organization, the function, and even the procedure of the tribunal were agreed upon. The only hindrance to its inauguration was the contention of the small states for absolute equality in the selection of judges. As it would be extremely unwieldy for forty-four judges to sit regularly in session, and as the small nations staunchly stood for equal rights in this particular, the delegates recommended the study of the difficulty during the interval between the second and third conferences. The obstacle is serious; but it is in no sense insurmountable.

Once more the pacific temper of the world disclosed itself when the question of a general arbitration treaty between all the nations was raised.[23] Though several powers vigorously opposed the agreement, they did so for the avowed reason that it would militate against the very end it was designed to further. The vote stood thirty-two to nine in favor of the treaty, with several abstentions. So, while the principle of universal obligatory arbitration was embodied in no concrete act, it was endorsed. It is worth noting in this connection that several "attempts" of the first conference became achievements of the second. During the intervening seven years, public opinion had become ready for them. It is highly probable that several important "attempts" of the second—and among them obligatory arbitration—will be realized in the third. Secretary Root expresses a fact and a hope in his words: "The most valuable result of the Conference of 1899 was that it made the Conference of 1907 possible. The achievements of the Conferences justify the belief that the world has entered upon an orderly process, through which, step by step, in successive conferences, each taking the work of its predecessor as its point of departure, there may be continual progress toward making the practice of civilized nations conform to their peaceful professions."[24]

What, then, constitutes the contribution of the Hague Conferences to the movement towards internationalism—towards the

23. Hull, op. cit., p. 490.

24. Quoted by Choate, op. cit., p. 87.

elimination of friction between national groups? How have they advanced us towards the ultimate attainment of that ideal social organization which is to prevail when wars and rumors of wars no longer exist—when the anarchy of nations has given way to law? First, valuable and definite benefits have resulted. So far, seventeen cases have been taken to the Hague, and every one of them has been peaceably settled.[25] Moreover, as an indirect outcome of this work, a number of arbitration treaties between the powers have been ratified.[26] Second, the educative forces set at work by this first great "Parliament of Man" were of no less value.[27] They revealed to the world the fact that the peoples were essentially alike, and that their interests harmonized to a remarkable degree. They impressed upon the nations the fact that civilization had reached the point where co-operation between national groups was indispensable to future progress. In short, the conferences brought together the opinions of the world's greatest statesmen on the world's gravest problem. By spreading the sentiment of universal brotherhood and good will, as well as by pointing out practical measures, the congress gave an impetus to the cause.

But, aside from the effects of these fine sentiments and practicable plans, the method and spirit of the work at the Hague exerted its influence. The careful analysis of the political conditions of the age and the care taken to adapt each scheme to these conditions is responsible in no small measure for their success. They worked with facts not as they ought to be but as they were. They fully appreciated the truth that permanent peace must be the product of evolution, and that schematic proposals which took no account of the defects of the actual world were worse than useless. In a word, every project recommended by them was accommodated to the principle of social evolution. They realized that humanity advances as the tortoise rather than as the hare. How do Christ's principles agree with theirs?

II.

An examination of the vast body of current literature which purposes to explain Christ's attitude towards war will reveal the

25. See Appendix, IV.
26. Choate, op. cit., p. 82.
27. Hull, op. cit., p. 497.

tendency on the part of a large number of writers to single out certain specific utterances of Jesus as the basis for their interpretations.[28] The literalists who are wont to proceed thus are commonly called militarists and pacifists. Both claim the Bible as the foundation of their creed. The former hold that war is not a necessary evil but an affirmative good.[29] In it, their argument runs, the finest virtues of our social life have their genesis. Furthermore, they point out the incidents in the life of Jesus to prove that He, too, adhered to such a philosophy. May not His advice to the disciple to sell his coat and buy a sword[30] be quoted as a Scriptural sanction of an increase in armaments? And when Jesus went into the temple, knocked over the tables, and drove out the money-lenders, did He not evince a most militaristic spirit?[31] Again, He specifically declared that His mission was not to bring peace "but a sword",[32] which was the recognized symbol of warfare. Such citations, this school of extremists assert, are an incontestable refutation of the statement that Christ was opposed to armed conflict. Vigorously the apologists for Mars maintain the Christian support of the precedence of might over right—a creed which General Bernhardi, one of the foremost exponents of militarism, bluntly sums up thus: "Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war."[33]

But Jesus was an open enemy of war, retort their antagonists, the pacifists. He admonished us to "resist not evil".[34] Therefore, carrying the command to its logical extreme—as did that arch-pacifist, Tolstoi[35]—civil government must be abolished—a principle the Bolsheviki compatriots of the Russian radical have evidently adopted as their own. On another occasion, Christ rebuked Peter, who had drawn a sword, with the warning that they who live by the sword shall perish by the sword.[36] Once more, did not the Savior extol the virtues of pacifism in His promise that the meek shall inherit the earth,[37] and that the peace-makers shall be called children of God?[38] And did He

28. Jefferson, op. cit., p. 58ff.
29. Angell, op. cit., p. 155ff.
30. Luke, 22:36.
31. Matthew, 21:12.
32. Matthew, 11:34.
33. Von Bernhardi, op. cit., p. 23.
34. Matthew, 5:59.
35. For Tolstoi's attitude see Freeman, op. cit., p. 79ff.
36. Matthew, 26:52.
37. Matthew, 5:5.
38. Matthew, 5:9.

not, as the supreme sacrifice of a life replete with sacrifices, submit His own person to the agony of Gethesemane? Finally, was not this meek attitude towards the world characteristic of His entire life? In the face of such evidence, how can one who professes to be a Christian murder his fellows or even resist their attacks? If your enemy bombard one port, disarm your other port, they interpret His Doctrines to mean. Jesus' great lesson of love—the kind of love that includes one's bitterest enemy—is diametrically opposed to war. The "irresistible might of meekness" is, to their minds, His sole weapon for righting the wrongs of the world.

Now the fundamental error into which the controversialists whose arguments precede have fallen in their application of Christ's teachings is their failure to apply the teachings as a whole rather than in detached segments.[39] The adage which says that even Satan may prove his argument by quotations from the Scriptures is applicable to the dispute between the militarists and pacifists. In order to ascertain the position Christ would take upon an issue of this kind, it is necessary to review not only the definite statements which bear upon the question but also to keep before us the whole character and teachings of the Nazarene. Jesus constantly spoke in the metaphor of the Orient;[40] and the apparent inconsistencies of His speech are often explicable by reference to other speeches and to His actions. Any attempt at literal interpretation must result in failure. Furthermore, it must be remembered that Jesus laid down no rules for the conduct of the social group in any particular situation.[41] His principles are general ones. The universal applicability of His doctrines inheres in His practice of striking at the root of evil rather than at any of its diverse branches, such as slavery and war. He aimed to lay down the principles of social action as derived from individual conduct.

If we accept the method of considering Christ's teachings in their entirety, we may rest assured that He was neither a militarist nor a pacifist. The assertion that Jesus did not preach a gospel of militarism no thinking student of the Bible can deny.

39. Jefferson, op., cit., p. 74ff.
40. Ibid., p. 74.
41. Ibid., p. 61.

He was the Prince of Peace.[42] He explicitly warned His disciples that His Kingdom could not be spread by the sword.[43] The conviction that the law of love "can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties"[44] was never His. It is, indeed, a faulty logic which, discarding the greater number of the Great Teacher's words, removes a few from their context and bases its conclusions entirely upon them.

On the other extreme, it is no less patent that He was not a peace-at-any-price advocate. It has become the custom of modern times to stress far too strongly the meekness and submissiveness of the Man and to pass with almost utter negligence over the sublime heroism of His character.[45] Jesus was pre-eminently a man. He contended against the evils of His day with all the strength of His manhood. He would never, as a citizen of the twentieth century, have counseled a people to submit to a peace imposing gross injustice upon the weak and helpless. For Himself He took no thought. His colossal altruism has never been equalled in the history of man. But who shall say that He would have failed to resort to force when the lives and freedom of those dependent upon Him had been jeopardized? As a matter of fact, He did apply force in the protection of His disciples on the eve of His crucifixion.[45a] That this force was supernatural matters little. Its *results* were physical. The important truth is—and even the meekest pacifist must concede it—that He would have resisted—and did resist—evil when it affected the safety of others.[46]

Indeed, the resistance of the evil which menaces the well-being of our fellows is the basis of moral law. What Christian would tamely submit to the sacking of his home and the murder of his family by a drunk burglar? What Christian community would do no more than register verbal protests when an irresponsible mob, terrorizing the populace and murdering prominent citizens, runs amuck through the streets? What Chris-

42. Isaiah, 9:6.
43. John, 18:36.
44. von Bernhardi, op. cit., p. 29.
45. No. Am., 204:195-202.
45a. John, 18:5-8.
46. Outlook, 109:61-63. No. Am., 202:879-887. Outlook, 111:305-307. Outlook, 111:596-597.

tian nation in the world's society would tolerate similar conduct on the part of a people trampling upon the rights, and murdering the citizens, of its sister states? "It is not written in any book that on such occasions we may use force, it is written in the tables of the heart. It is a law sacred and divine which antedates the decalogue, and it will never be repealed."[47] Jesus did not teach that in cases like these the Christian procedure was submission. We need neither sing a Hymn of Hate nor display a savage, un-Christian spirit to protect the world against the forces of evil. If we apply the spirit of the Man rather than fragmentary exerpts of His speeches, we are safe in the assertion that He stood for war when it meant the mitigation of human misery and the freedom of oppressed peoples. In an admirable discussion as to whether or not Jesus would have been a "conscientious objector" were He now living, Harold Bell Wright, the popular novelist, writes: "As long as men bring war for the wrong, men must go to war for the right. As long as evil fights for evil, good must battle for good. As long as the nations that seek to live by war assail the nations that would live by peace, the armies of peace must take the field."[48]

How, then, may we reconcile Christ's sanction of the use of force with His utterances which can only be interpreted to mean that the ideal way of settling differences is through peaceful channels? What is the *tertium quid*—not militarism, not pacifism—Christ would advocate today? The answer is simple. Jesus recognized the place of war—the clash of group against group—in the development of nations; but He recognized, too, that the process of social evolution tended away from a state of universal war—the "normal" state of nature—towards a state of universal peace. War, like slavery, may be a very useful institution in its period—which is the boyhood of nations. But as men advance, the need for it becomes obsolete, and it checks progress. Universal peace is the ideal. War is not an affirmative good, to be preserved because of its intrinsic worth. It is a means to an end. The day will come when wars will be no more, and when swords will be beaten into plowshares.[49] Be-

47. Jefferson, op. cit., p. 78.
48. Am. Mag., 85 (No. 6): 7-8.
49. Isaiah, 2:4.

fore then, conflicts must be. "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet."[50] That sentence contains the essence of Christ's teachings on war. The strife is bound to come; but—and here lies our greatest hope—the end is not yet. The end is not fighting and bloodshed. The end is harmony. It is an answer to our prayer for God's Kingdom on earth.

III.

In the preceding pages, we have sought to make it clear that the purpose of the Hague Conferences was not to advance any radical scheme for the immediate elimination of war but to accommodate their plans to the normal progress of the race. This assertion we have supported by an analytical survey of the conferences. Our next concern was to show that Jesus voiced the same principles when He pointed out perpetual peace as the goal of social evolution. The conservatism of such an attitude was contrasted with the radicalism of the militarist and the pacifist. Before outlining a feasible and Christian means of furthering the cause, it will be worth while to make a prefatory inquiry into the stage of evolutionary development extant in the contemporary social order. Then we shall be conversant with the facts that must be considered in the formulation of a practicable plan to minimize the probabilities of war. In discussing the forces conducive to a recourse to arms, it is convenient to consider the psychological and political factors separately.

It is the consensus of opinion among careful students of political science that much of the feeling which gives rise to international friction comes into existence through an intense spirit of nationalism.[51] Any one familiar with European political conditions previous to the outbreak of the war could not fail to know of the jingo's practice of playing upon the people's fear of aggressive attack by a foreign nation. The same alarmists have further fostered this spirit by their appeal to "corporate ego-

50. Matthew, 24:7.
51. Hart, School Books and International Prejudices, p. 4. Buxton, op. cit., p. 24ff.

tism,"[52] or national pride. Chauvinism is not yet extinct. Such an emotional state common to millions of people is illustrative of the inertia of passions the logical basis for which has long since been removed. Suspicions that other peoples are plotting against their existence, as well as pride in conquering others, are slow to disappear in any nation.

Not less harmful to the cause of peace than this attempt to influence the masses by their feelings of fear and pride is the militarist's effort to lay before them a defense of war which will appeal to their reason. Extending the Darwinian theory to include nations, he declares group conflict a biological necessity.[53] On the surface, this advocacy of killing off the nation's enemies does have the appearance of being in consonance with the law of natural selection, for the strongest nation is presumably the victor. "War," von Bernhardi neatly phrases the philosophy, "gives a biologically just decision, since its decision rests on the very nature of things."[54] Their apotheosis of war exerts a strong influence upon the minds of men in all social classes. That the militarists have misread the law of social evolution will become evident when we take up the social elements working for peace. Suffice it to say here that in so far as these claims have gained popular credence, they are prejudical to the cause of peace. It is not facts but what men think of facts that determines their actions.

In addition to the psychological reactions of feeling and intellect which facilitate an opening of hostilities, we are confronted with their fruit in unsatisfactory political adjustments between states. No thinking European statesman could have been blind to the fact that the system of rivalry in the acquisition of armaments, which held sway before 1914, was certain to end in catastrophe.[55] No stable peace could ever be founded upon so unstable an arrangement as the balance of power.[56] Truly does Hobson say that the real purpose of the balance was the weighing of it to one side.[57] The very existence of such vast accumulations of armaments was in itself sufficient to engender fear of

52. Dickinson in "Towards a Lasting Settlement," p. 27.
53. Angell, op. cit., pp. 155-167.
54. von Bernhardi, op. cit., p. 20.
55. Dickinson, After the War, p. 7.
56. Review of Reviews, 80:488-489.
57. Hobson, Towards International Government, p. 23.

aggression and to inspire the militarists' minds with ambitious schemes for conquest. The avowed reason for manufacturing armaments was insurance against war; the actual result was deeper suspicion—and war. The second force which went far towards making war inevitable—the secret diplomacy of Europe—has the same defense.[58] A few men held the peace of the world in their hands. Their deeds were all done under the cloak of secrecy. The fundamental principle of their creed was that the interests of states were irreconcilable; and, dispensing with all rules of morality, they made it their sole business to outwit one another.[59] The majority of international relations were conducted in the dark. Like the increasing armaments, they led directly to war. The greatest lesson that the world can learn from the bloody ordeal through which it is now passing is that before it can hope for anything like permanent peace, there must come a political re-organization, characterized by a limitation of armaments and democratic diplomacy.

A consideration of the existant psychological and political forces which give birth to war is all too apt to make us pessimistic as to the possibility of immediate steps for the abolition of international anarchy. Yet a close inspection of society as it is today constituted will warrant our attempt at curtailing future orgies of bloodshed. From our enumeration of the fundamental causes of war, let us turn to characteristics of the present age which give promise that the day of peace is not distant.

Time after time, the economic progress of the group has resulted in the substitution of law for brute force.[60] As men emerge from a state of self-sufficiency, they come to a realization of the value of co-operation. Then begins a crude division of labor. One man produces a single commodity and *depends upon his neighbors* for his other necessities. This interdependence brings about the rejection of force as the predominating factor in economic relations. The stage of direct appropriation has passed. An exceedingly selfish man can no longer openly overpower his fellow and deprive him of property? In an

58. Ibid., p. 204. Dickinson, After the War, p. 34.
59. Buxton, op. cit., p. 16.
60. Angell, op. cit., p. 261ff.

analogous way, tribal communities have availed themselves of the advantages of trading with one another by submission to law. Proceeding to larger units, this evolutionary tendency has effected such a high degree of interdependence between nations that it is now impossible for a nation to derive gain from the appropriation of the territory of another. Economic forces have speeded the drift from war.[61]

Nor are the peace factors of history wholly economic. Once more does the story of the past sanction our contention that the day is not remote when a resort to arms will be unthought of, in the widening of men's sympathies as civilization progresses from age to age.[62] From the time when the family was the legal unit to the twentieth century, when the inhabitants of a nation are inspired by the love of a common fatherland, the broadening of human sympathies has been uninterrupted. Progress has been away from force.[63] He who today holds that the abolition of armed encounters between the powers is a dream impossible of fulfillment places himself in the same position as the ultra-conservatives of a few centuries ago, who believed that law would never supersede private war and brigandage. Indeed, so many points of resemblance does the question we are discussing bear to the question of the duel that it would not be amiss for us to make note of the way in which that problem came to its solution.[64] Four distinct stages are present in the history of private war. In early days, kinship was the sole bond. Law did not exist. Revenge and retaliation by kinsmen were the only checks on crime. Later, tribes were formed, and vengeance was regulated. The third step was the inauguration of courts to exist side by side with the institution of vengeance. A man could bring his grievance before the court, but resort to a tribunal was optional. Finally, private war was abolished; and all differences were declared to be within the jurisdiction of the court. May we not say that the society of nations, having passed through the first two periods, is now in the third stage of the evolution—the stage in which courts exist side by side with

61. Cf. infra, p. 28.
62. Lecture in course in educational Psychology, by Prof. Carter, 1917-18.
63. Fried, op. cit., p. 11ff.
64. Independent, 80:427-429.

the custom of war, but in which an appeal to them is not obligatory? There remains but one more step to the unconditional repudiation of war as a national policy. How long will men take to make it?

We may be reasonably sure they will not take long. We must take into full account the law of social acceleration[65]—a law which says that the nearer we come to our goal, the faster do we gravitate towards it. As Mr. Angell clearly points out, in all that pertains to this discussion, man was for three hundred thousand years unchanged. Then, a comparatively brief period of two thousand years has witnessed "changes in human nature," if we wish to express it so, greater than did hundreds of preceding centuries. To diminish the scale, after living fifty years as a cannibal, man in three months became Smith of New York, using a telephone, patronizing a commercial bank, and dealing in real estate loans. Slavery, the duel, and other social evils which men a few generations ago declared to be forever with the race have all been destroyed. The law of evolutionary acceleration hastens the end of war.

The verdict of history, therefore, is against the eternal rule of Mars. And the characteristics of present society strengthen the conviction left by historical analysis. One of the most salient traits of the century—a trait certainly of good omen—is a widely spread peace sentiment among the peoples of the world. No one is more cognizant of the existence of this sentiment than the militarists, who lament it loudly. Von Bernhardi wrote his famous book, according to his own confession, to counteract "the aspirations for peace which seem to dominate our age and threaten to poison the soul of the German people".[66] Further on in the same work, he deplores the fact that "we are accustomed to regard war as a curse, and refuse to recognize it as the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power".[67] Again, "The desire for peace has rendered most nations anaemic, and marks a decay of spirit and political courage such as has often been shown by a race of Epigoni."[68] Alas for militarism, the people are beginning to "reason why" before they

65. Angell, op. cit., p. 220.
66. von Bernhardi, op. cit., p. 14.
67. Ibid., p. 11.
68. Ibid., p. 17

"do and die". "The mass of the people," said Bismark to the Reichstag, "has usually no inclination for war. The torch of war is lit by minorities, or, in absolute governments by rulers or cabinets."[69] Testimony from such sources supports the declaration that men are refusing to glory in war as an end in itself. The zone of reason is widening.

As it widens, the masses of people are wresting from the hands of "minorities" and "rulers or cabinets" the power to plunge them into war. We could not attach nearly so much significance to this popular will for peace, were it not for the remarkable democratization of governments now in progress. Not only have the peoples acquired a pronounced aversion to war; but they have also come into political power which gives that sentiment tremendous weight. Intelligent democracies will not tolerate unnecessary wars. Moreover, publicity in diplomacy, a special phase of this democratic movement, works effectively for peace.[70] Secret treaties are less frequently binding whole nations to plunge into bloody conflict. An outstanding feature of the war is that its diplomacy is being mainly conducted not by notes to foreign ministers but by addresses to representatives of the people.[71] The synthesis of a popular demand for peace and a popular control of the government and publicity in the contraction of treaties is the surest guarantee of peace.

By no means least of the factors forcing Mars' exit from the scene of human activities is the present economic organization of the world.[72] The civilized portion of the earth is an economic unit. The division of labor is international. The telegraph, the steamship, and other means of travel and communication have converted the globe into one big neighborhood. No longer can a nation hold aloof in "splendid isolation". The system of foreign trade, foreign exchange, and the numberless other forces facilitating closer relations between states are "entangling alliances" from which no nation desirous of the advantages of modern civilization can extricate itself. Conquest is altogether unprofitable.[73] It is impossible for a nation of the

69. Dickinson, Foundations of a League of Peace, p. 20.
70. Review of Reviews, 51:33-34.
71. See Appendix, V.
72. Angell, op. cit., p. 32ff. cf. supra, p. 26.
73. Living Age, 281:565-568.

twentieth century to enrich itself by looting a conquered territory and enslaving the inhabitants. The annexation of land brings no new wealth, for the owners are annexed with the land. The citizens of the conquering country are not one bit weathier. Nor is their commerce materially increased; for, in these days of international movements of capital, economic investments are not restricted to national boundaries. Not even do indemnities always result in financial benefit. In the case of the Franco-Prussian Indemnity Fund of 1871, the financial results were more beneficial to the payer than to the nation exacting payment. It took Germany years to recover from the victory of 1871. This dearth of material advantage in wars of conquest is, doubtlessly, partially responsible for the wide-spread peace sentiment.

The discussion thus far has been devoted to the consideration of the Hague Conferences and their part in forwarding the cause of peace, of the teachings of Jesus and their fundamental concordance with the principles advanced at the Hague, and, finally, of the practical questions besetting those who are striving to lay the foundations for lasting harmony. The Hague has been chosen as the nucleus of our study both because it stands for the highest type of international organization yet attained, and because it has made definite steps in the direction of stable peace. The mere fact that no attempt was there made to do more than the people were ready for, and—this is equally important—that there was no tendency to lag behind what the people were ready for, places it in a class by itself. The analysis of contemporary world politics has made clear what forces are allied with the concert of powers at the Hague, and what forces they must combat. The fact of greatest encouragement is that the factors for war are in the process of decay, whereas those militating for peace are growing at a marvelous rate. Our next task is to outline a program by which the brotherhood of Christian nations—nay, of all nations—may foster the forces making for peace and inhibit the operation of those which can result only in war. This is no time to wait fatalistically for the evolutionary process to come to our aid. Throughout history, reason has been prominent in directing the course of evolution.

Let us sedulously apply ourselves to the construction of machinery for peace.

IV.

Before we arrive at a solution in accord with Christ's teachings, we must posit a disposition on the part of states to recognize the existence of supernatural law.[74] No influence has been more detrimental to the cause of permanent peace than the false doctrine of the sovereignty and autonomy of nations. To the extent that sovereignty denotes the right of a free people to shape their own destiny, it is desirable. But to the extent that it connotes exemption from moral law, it is hostile to the cause.[75] No sane person would contend that the individual's obligation to respect the rights of others impairs his personal freedom. Nor can such a statement be true of nations. The interpretation of sovereignty as license to violate moral rules is the basis of that pernicious theory of the state, adherence to which has had an inevitable termination in the present conflict. "Unconditional sovereignty," writes Darwin P. Kingsley, "was the fundamental error in the civilization of 1914."[76] The society of nations must have law. As Cicero says, *Ubi societas, ibi jus.*[77] Assuming, then, that nations, like men, should be governed by a moral code, we shall inquire into a means of guaranteeing the observance of that code.

The suggestion of the statesmen of the twentieth century to meet the twentieth century's need of some means of insuring a judicial settlement of international disputes has been the proposal for a League to Enforce Peace.[78] The system of alliances must become one of alliance. Because the idea is a suitable continuation of the international organization initiated at the Hague, and because it has been endorsed by the most astute politicians of our time, it is fitting that we seriously entertain it. Its provisions are four.[79] The first is concerned with the settlement of justiciable international questions by a judicial tribunal competent to pass judgment both on the merits and the

74. Independent, 85:153-154.
75. No. Am., 201:853-859.
76. Independent, 85:153.
77. Mohonk Conference Report for 1916, p. 12.
78. Ashbee, American League to Enforce Peace, Mohonk Report for 1916, p. 55ff. Dickinson, After the War, p. 25.
79. See Appendix, VI and VII.

jurisdiction of a case. A justiciable question is defined as one which can be settled in accordance with the principles of law and equity. The stipulation that the court be granted power to say whether a question is justiciable or not is important, since a recalcitrant power might otherwise refuse arbitration on the grounds that the question did not lie within the court's jurisdiction. The second article supplements the first by making provision for the pacific settlement of non-justiciable disputes—for example, our restriction of Japanese immigration. Such a policy—while not illegal—might very conceivably be the cause of serious international complications, just as refusal to allow a neighbor's child to play on the lawn may result in a quarrel.[80] For the peaceful solution of such differences, the plan includes a Council of Conciliation, the purpose of which is to inquire into the facts and to recommend something in the nature of a compromise. Like the other tribunal, the council aims to obviate the necessity for the arbitrament of war. Both bodies might appropriately be stationed at the Hague, where the forces for international good will are strongest.

The decisions of neither agency, however, are to be enforced by the military strength of the League. The point at which force figures is in the obligation of the disputants to present their claims to the tribunal. In case a member of the alliance, the third article reads, fails to comply with this requirement, the other powers are to make joint use of their economic and military resources against the offender. The threat of such action, the proponents of the plan believe, will ordinarily prove a sufficient deterrent to a nation contemplating violation of the act. Indeed, economic pressure, alone, will exert such a powerful influence that military action will probably not be called for. As a direct outcome of the hearings which compulsory arbitration will necessitate, a large number of discrepancies in the interpretation of international law will come to light. To utilize this experience for the advancement of the law of nations, the plan proposes, as a fourth measure, regular world conferences to codify the rules of international law. In this

80. Lecture by William H. Taft at the University of Kansas.

way, the third and fourth divisions of the proposal provide for compulsion in arbitration and the development of laws according to which the arbitration is to be conducted, as the first and second provide the necessary machinery for such arbitration.

The proposition as above outlined impresses the political leaders of the world as being peculiarly adapted to our needs. And it is no digression to note that nothing has done more towards the preparation of the public for some such project than the war itself.[81] On this point, let us quote a few authorities. Mr. Asquith comes to the conclusion: "It means, finally, or it ought to mean, perhaps by a slow and gradual process, the substitution for force, for the clash of competing ambitions, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise—the substitution for all these things of a real European partnership, based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will. A year ago that would have sounded like a Utopian idea. It is probably one that may not, or will not, be realized either today or tomorrow. If and when this war is decided in favor of the Allies, it will at once come within the range, and before long within the grasp, of European statesmanship."[82] And the pacific state of the public mind leads even the German Chancellor to promise: "Germany is at all times ready to join a league of nations—yes, even to place herself at the head of such a league—to keep in check the disturbers of the peace."[83] What a change of front since the obstructionist attitude maintained by Germany at the Hague. Our President adds his voice to these. "Only," he says, "when the great nations of the world have reached some sort of an agreement as to what they hold to be fundamental to their common interest, and as to some feasible method of acting in concert when any nation or group of nations seeks to disturb those fundamental things can we feel that civilization is at least in a way of justifying its existence and claiming to be finally established."[84] Again, he pledges the nation's support of the idea: "I am sure I speak the mind and wish of the people of America when I say that the United States is willing to become a partner

81. See Appendix, VIII.
82. Cosmos, op. cit., p. 90.
83. Ibid., p. 91.
84. Ibid., p. 91.

in any feasible association of nations formed in order to realize these objects and make them secure against violation.''[85] The opinions of the men here quoted, in addition to those of Sir Edward Grey, Monsieur Briand, Mr. von Jargon, and ex-President Taft, who are staunch supporters of the League, should not be discredited.[86] The sanction of conservative thinkers argues strongly for the practicability of this solution of our problem.

Despite the large number of prominent men who subscribe to the principles of the League, there are defects in the plan which will necessitate modifications in some details. The criticism that certain nations now in alliance with others will adhere to their alliance in truth, even after the formation of a general union, may be easily dismissed. The reason for the present groupings of nations is that they believe that their interests demand it. When this reason disappears, the old affections will gradually be replaced by a loyalty to the world as a whole. The history of wars abounds in illustrations of nations one generation enemies; allies in the next. Yet the second objection raised is a more formidable one. Since the League is to be based on the *status quo* of a certain time, are the injustices of the present to be thus perpetuated?[87] That there can be some way of righting injustice other than by the arbitrament of war seems beyond dispute. We may leave the settlement of this question to the powers entering the agreement. As the futility of a policy of ''splendid isolation'' has been shown in the preceding pages, we may pass lightly over the reasoning of those who quote Washington's advice to steer clear of European wars.[88] A very important contingency which must be taken into account is the possibility of the allied nations who boycott a refractory member bearing an unequal share of the resultant loss in trade. Some way of equalizing such economic loss may be thought out. The obstacles are real; yet they are in no wise insuperable.

But a consideration of the advantages which would attend

85. Historical Light on the League to Enforce Peace, p. 1.
86. Mohonk Report for 1916, p. 59.
87. New Republic, 2:167-169. von Bernhardi, op. cit., p. 32.
88. Mohonk Report for 1916, p. 145.

the formation of the league will leave us convinced that a trial of the project is imperative. To commence with, the maladjustment of the political organization of the world to the internationalization of the factors making for civilization would be remedied.[89] A definite stop would be put to the amassing of armaments; and the evils of secret diplomacy would cease to exist. Furthermore, the publicity of international affairs would check the overt acts of diplomats. It would also do much to dispel the narrow patriotism which is all too prevalent in the world today. The recognition and conscious direction of the confederative trend of history would be a long step towards the elimination of war. For several centuries, thinkers have advocated some sort of federation, loose though it must be at first, as the only way to end war. Thus would the league furnish the world with a peaceful agency for adjusting international troubles.

Then, too, the moderation of the league's aims would be another factor contributing to its usefulness. Its purpose is to make war less probable, not impossible. No effort would be made to enforce the observance of its decisions. The court would rely on international public opinion for that. Thus the plan is founded on the theory that as soon as war is made the last resort in public opinion and the policy of statesmen, it will cease to be resorted to at all.[90] The delay and discussion will give men a chance to think. Wars would not be entered in the heat of passion. Suspicions between nations would gradually be destroyed by this substitution of police force for aggressive and defensive force. The problem is one of doing between the nations what has already been done within them.[91] The transfer of power from use for self-interest to disinterested hands is the greatest stride we could make.[92] The inauguration of such a concert at the Hague would mean that the dark ages of political anarchy have passed, and that the future chapters of the world's history will be free from the bloody records of human conflict.

89. Dickinson, After the War, p. 22.
90. Dickinson, Foundations of a League of Peace, p. 12.
91. Mohonk Report for 1915, p. 51.
92. Mohonk Report for 1916, p. 36.

Notwithstanding the many benefits consequent upon our adoption of this plan, *pari passu* with such a course of action must go a campaign of education to destroy the mistaken notions and public policies which lead to war. Pestalozzi's dictum that education is the most powerful means of social redemption has not yet been disproved. The day has passed when textbooks dilating upon the physical prowess of our nation and instilling an admiration for America to the disparagement of other countries should find place in our schools. The younger generation should be taught that there is a fundamental community of human interests the world over, and that all modern movements for humanity are international in character.[93] For no matter what the facts are, if the world is blind to those facts, it will fail to change. Much of our present trouble is traceable to ignorance. Men fight, we commonly say, because they "fail to come to an understanding". The idiom is literally true. When men "come to an understanding"—an understanding of the gross stupidity of settling their differences by the sword—they will cease to fight. Until then, it is the part of the protagonists for peace to turn the light of reason on the dark practices of the age and to reveal the truth concerning war. For primarily requisite to international organization is the international mind on the part of the masses.[94] No more is it the office of our schools to produce citizens of a nation. The children of today must be prepared for citizenship of the world. Christianity demands the dissemination of its gospel of peace and good will.

Such, in the barest outline, is the pathway to peace according to the teachings of Jesus. In our treatment of the Christian nations' duty in eliminating war, we have made a brief compendium of the principal work of the Hague Conferences, which are the only semblance of international authority of our times. In particular, we dwelt upon the attention they gave the principle of social evolution. We then took up the mooted question as to what attitude Jesus assumed on the same topic; and we found His teachings agreeing that, while war is a transitory

93. Bushnell, op. cit., p. 4. 94. Cosmos, op. cit., p. 66.

necessity, peace is the ultimate goal. To make clear the program it was incumbent upon the Christian nations to follow, we next sought to determine the stage the evolutionary process had reached. In an analysis of world politics, we found the forces for war, while still powerful, passing,[95] and the peace factors occupying an increasingly important place. Bearing these things in mind, we concluded that the Christian means of egress from this system of wars was the creation of police force to make obligatory the presentation of cases to a judicial tribunal before the rupture of peaceful relations. Here we advocated the adoption of the plan for a League to Enforce Peace as the most efficacious guarantee against future strife.

After the conclusion of peace, when the nations once more convene at the Hague, in a conference formerly planned for 1915,[96] formal recognition should be accorded the momentous change that has occurred in the relations of states. A war-weary world, bleeding from the ravages of the most titanic conflict yet staged in history, will at last turn to reason as the final arbiter. And if the Hague is true to its traditions, we may expect that some such alliance as the League will be there sanctioned. For the war has done more to spread the peace sentiment than a century of preaching could have done. Until that day of harmony, it is ours to battle on for the cause of permanent peace—a peace secure from disturbance by militaristic autocracies. A world safe for democracy is a world free from militarism, and a world free from militarism is a world ready for peace on a permanent basis. The future relations of peoples must—and will—be something more than a temporary truce—a latent war—certain to culminate in an armed encounter. Stable peace must be had at any price,—even at the price we are paying, the price of universal war. The horrible experience through which the world is now passing is the birth-agony of a new social order—an order in which democracy predominates and law reigns supreme. For ages immemorial, men have worshiped Mars. Today his mask has been mercilessly stripped from him and in the dawn of an enlightened era, he stands re-

95. Craftsman, 27:79-80.

96. Hull, op. cit., p. 500ff.

vealed as a demon--not a god. In the court of international public opinion, from whose decree all appeal is vain, there is no question but that the verdict of "guilty" will be returned against him. In the signs of the times, we read the doom of war. Let the nations execute the judgment through their concert at the Hague.

APPENDIX

I. "In case of serious disagreement or conflict, before an appeal to arms, the signatory Powers agree to have recourse, as far as circumstances allow, to the good offices or mediation of one or more friendly Powers.

"Independently of this recourse, the signatory Powers recommend that one or more Powers, strangers to the dispute, should, on their own initiative, and as far as circumstances may allow, offer their good offices or mediation to the states at variance.

"Powers, strangers to the dispute, have the right to offer good offices or mediation, even during the course of hostilities.

"The exercise of this right can never be regarded by one or the other of the parties in conflict as an unfriendly act."[97]

II. "There is also another gain,—incidental but of real and permanent value; and this is the inevitable development of the law of nations by the decisions of such a Court of Arbitration composed of the most eminent jurists from all countries. Thus far it has been evolved from the writings of scholars often conflicting, from the decisions of national courts biased by local patriotism, from the practices of various powers, on land and sea, more in obedience to their interests than to their sense of justice; but now we may hope for the growth of a great body of international law under the best conditions possible and ever more and more in obedience to the great impulse given by Grotius in the direction of right, reason and mercy."[98]

III. "The Contracting Powers agree not to have recourse to armed force for the recovery of contract debts claimed from the Government of one country by the Government of another country as being due to its nationals.

"This undertaking is, however, not applicable when the debtor state refuses or neglects to reply to an offer of arbitration, or, after accepting the offer, prevents any *compromis*

97. Scott, Hague Conventions and Declarations, p. 43.

98. White, quoted by Choate, op. cit., p. 39.

from being agreed on, or, after the arbitration, fails to submit to the award."[99]

IV. A list of the cases submitted to the Hague Court follows:

The Pious Fund Case, involving the United States and Mexico (1902).

The Venezuelan Preferential Claim Case, involving Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Venezuela (1904).

The Japanese House Tax Case, involving Great Britain, France, Germany, and Japan (1905).

The Muscat Dhows Case, involving France and Great Britain (1905).

The Castablanca Case, involving France and Germany (1909).

The Grisbadarna Case, involving Norway and Sweden (1909).

The North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case, involving the United States and Great Britain (1910).

The Orinocco Steamship Case, between the United States and Venezuela (1910).

The Savarkar Case, involving France and Great Britain (1911).

The Canevaro Case, involving Italy and Peru (1912).

The Russian Indemnity Case, involving Russia and Turkey (1912).

The Carthage Case, involving France and Italy (1913).

The Manouba Case, involving France and Italy (1913).

The Island of Timor Case, involving the Netherlands and Portugal (1914).

The two cases brought before the Commission of Inquiry follow:

The North Sea or Dogger Bank Case, involving Russia and Great Britain (1904).

The Tavignana, Camouna, and Gaulois Cases, involving France and Italy.[100]

V. "Diplomats of the older school are watching with keen

99. Scott, Hague Peace Conferences, p. 415.

100. See Scott, Hague Court Reports, or, Wilson, op. cit.

interest the 'extra official negotiations' which depart so radically from the ancient and accepted practices of diplomacy. They point out that peace negotiations on a great scale are actually going on, only instead of being conducted secretly in the round table conference, which was the aim of the Central Powers in the early stages of the war, the great war issues are now being expounded and critically analyzed in the light of publicity and the world's Forum." [101]

VI. The provisions of the League read as follows:

"*First.* All justiciable questions arising between the signatory Powers not settled by negotiation shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to the jurisdiction of the question.

"*Second.* All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a Council of Conciliation for hearing, consideration, and recommendation.

"*Third.* The signatory Powers shall jointly use forthwith both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories, before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing.

"*Fourth.* Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time, to formulate and codify rules of international law which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereby govern in the decisions of the judicial tribunal mentioned in article 1." [102]

VII. The preamble to the constitution of the League is worth quoting *verbatim*:

"Throughout five thousand years of recorded history, Peace, here and there established, has been kept, and its area has been widened, in one way only. Individuals have combined their efforts to suppress violence in the local community. Com-

101. Kansas City Times, Feb. 12, 1918.

102. Ashbee, op. cit., p. 33ff.

munities have co-operated to maintain the authoritative State and to preserve Peace within its borders. States have formed leagues or confederations, or have otherwise co-operated to establish Peace among themselves. Always Peace has been made and kept, when made and kept at all, by the superior power of superior numbers acting in unity for the common good.

"Mindful of this teaching of experience, we believe and solemnly urge that the time has come to devise and to create a working union of sovereign nations to establish Peace among themselves and to guarantee it by all known and available sanctions at their command, to the end that civilization may be conserved, and the progress of mankind in comfort, enlightenment, and happiness may continue."[103]

VIII. "The war has prepared the world for much that it would not have accepted three years ago. It is the task of statesmen to ascertain what instructed public opinion is now willing to support and to fix it in international relations."[104]

103. Ibid., p. 29.

104. Cosmos, op. cit., p. 88.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

Angell, Norman. The Great Illusion (fourth edition). G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1913.

The Arbiter in Council (anonymous). The MacMillan Company, New York, 1906.

Ashbee, C. R. The American League to Enforce Peace. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1917.

Bang, J. P. Hurrah and Hallelujah. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1917.

Bible.

Buxton, C. B. (editor). Towards a Lasting Settlement. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1916.

Choate, Joseph H. The Two Hague Conferences. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1913.

Dickinson, G. Lowes. After the War. A. C. Fifield, London, 1915.

Enforced Peace. Proceedings of the first annual national assemblage of the League to Enforce Peace, Washington, 1916. League to Enforce Peace, New York, 1916.

Foster, John W. Arbitration and the Hague Court. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, New York, 1904.

Freeman, Daniel Roy. God and War. Richard G. Badger, Boston, 1915.

Fried, Alfred H. The German Emperor and the Peace of the World (second edition). Hodder and Stoughton, New York, 1912.

Goldsmith, Robert. A League to Enforce Peace. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1917.

Headlam, J. W. The Issue. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, New York, 1917.

Hobson, John Atkinson. Towards International Government. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1915.

Hugins, Roland · The Possible Peace. The Century Company, New York, 1916.

Hull, William I. The Two Hague Conferences and their Contribution to International Law. Ginn and Company, Boston, 1908.

Jefferson, Charles Edward. Christianity and International Peace. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Publishers, New York, 1915.

Jordan, David Starr. Unseen Empire. American Unitarian Association, Boston, 1912.

Liebknecht, Karl. Militarism. B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1917.

Lynch, Frederick. The Last War. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago, 1915.

Muir, Ramsay. Nationalism and Internationalism. Constable and Company, Ltd., London, 1916.

Scott, James Brown (editor). The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907. Oxford University Press, New York, 1915.

Scott, James Brown. The Hague Court Reports. Oxford University Press, New York, 1916.

Scott, James Brown. The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Vols. I and II. The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1909.

Taft, William H. The United States and Peace. C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1914.

Trueblood, B. F. The Federation of the World. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, 1899.

Von Bernhardi, F. Germany and the Next War (Allen H. Powles, translator). Longmans, Green, and Company, New York, 1914.

Wilson, George Grafton. The Hague Arbitration Cases. Ginn and Company, Boston, 1915.

PERIODICALS:

American Magazine, 78:17. Militarism and Christianity, by L. Tolstoy.

American Magazine, 85 (No. 6):7-8. The Sword of Jesus, by Harold Bell Wright.

Annals American Academy, 60:222-229. Six Essentials of Permanent Peace, by A. Schvan.

Annals American Academy, 61:243-244. How can America Best Contribute towards Constructive and Durable Peace? by C. W. Elliott.

Annals American Academy, 66:35-43. Basis of a Durable Peace.

Atlantic Monthly, 115:6-14. Christianity and War, by A. Repplier.

Atlantic Monthly, 116:600-607. Waiting, by A. Repplier.

Atlantic Monthly, 118:316-323. Acropolis and Golgotha, by E. Dudley.

Biblical World, 44:36-44. Personal Religion of Jesus, by A. G. Lawson.

Biblical World, 49:139-146. Cosmopolitanism of Jesus as Related to Kingdom Ideals, by W. A. Elliott.

Biblical World, 49:37-38. Non-resistance and the Gospel.

Bookman, 45:113-120. Was Jesus Christ a Pacifist? by W. F. Cooley.

Bookman, 45:37-43. Philosophy of Militarism: its Exponents and its Critics, by W. Riley.

Century, 89:230-236. From Caesar to Kaiser, by E. D. Schoonmaker.

Contemporary, 106:628-636. Proposals for a League of Peace and Mutual Protection among Nations, by A. Williams.

Craftsman, 27:79-80. Passing of the War Virtues, by J. Addams.

Current Opinion, 57:259-262. War as a Sign of Failure of Christian Civilization.

Current Opinion, 56:447. Taking the Bible as the Textbook of the Social Revolution.

Current Opinion, 57:341-343. How to Pray and What to Pray for in the International Crisis.

Current Opinion, 58:107-108. War and the Christianity that has Never been Tried.

Current Opinion, 62:112-113. Christianity's Chances of Survival after War as they Appear to Rationalists.

Current Opinion, 62:82-85. Will the United States Fight to Preserve the Peace of the World?

Dial, 56:281-283. When Swords Become Plowshares.

Everybody's Magazine, 33:702-707. Spirit of the Age, by H. Black.

Everybody's Magazine, 31:842-849. When Christians Fight, are they Christians? by G. Garrett.

Everybody's Magazine, 33:249-250. What is International Law?

Forum, 53:289-303. War against War, by W. D. Sheldon.

Forum, 57:533-566. Peace by Coercion, by H. M. Chittendon.

Harper's Weekly, 59:367-368. Bernhardi and the United States, by N. Hapgood.

Harper's Weekly, 60:259. Essentials of Lasting Peace, by L. D. Brandeis.

Independent, 76:586-587. America, Christianity and Peace, by J. Gibbons.

Independent, 79:83-84. Basis for a League of Peace.

Independent, 80:43-44. Enforcement of Peace.

Independent, 79:427-429. Way to Disarm: a Practical Proposal, by H. Holt.

Independent, 77:338-341. Arbitration Treaties that Mean Something, by W. H. Taft.

Independent, 77:228-230. Peace by Arbitration, by A. Carnegie.

Independent, 78:136-138. Promise of World Federation, by W. H. Taft.

Independent, 77:379-380. Why not Arbitrate Everything? by W. H. Taft.

Independent, 81:13-17. Utopia or Hell, by T. Roosevelt.

Independent, 86:264. Three Presidents on The League to Enforce Peace.

Independent, 85:153-155. The World's Fundamental Error, by D. P. Kingsley.

Independent, 84:421. Cursed are the Peace-makers.

Literary Digest, 49:463-464. Collapse of Civilization.

Literary Digest, 49:197-198. Agents of War on War.

Literary Digest, 48:1318. Passing of the War Spirit.

Literary Digest, 49:1123. Training the International Mind.

Literary Digest, 52:1637. War's Test of Christianity.

Literary Digest, 53:1238. To Make Peace Permanent.

Literary Digest, 51:1356. Christ and Preparedness.

Literary Digest, 52:1683-1685. President Wilson's Peace Plan.

Living Age, 292:771-779. Future Machinery of Peace, by J. G. Snead-Cox.

Living Age, 294:757-761. Prevention of War.

Missionary Review, 38:849-851. Christ's Conditions of Peace, by J. H. Jowett.

Missionary Review, 40:667-673. Church and the World Today, by R. E. Speer.

Nation, 100:78. Christian Ideals and the War, by W. W. Comfort.

Nation, 101:677-678. Voice of Reason.

New Republic, 2:167-169. League of Peace.

New Republic, 1:6-7. Lowes Dickinson's Plan.

New Republic, 6:91-93. Equal Rights of Nations, by E. D. Dickinson.

North American, 200:817-820. Our Prayer for Peace, by G. Harvey.

North American, 200:887-892. Practical Mediation and International Peace, by C. H. Sherill.

North American, 202:879-887. Was Jesus a Non-resistant? by J. H. Holmes.

North American, 201:853-859. International Morality, by D. J. Hill.

North American, 204:195-202. Christianity and the Sword, by S. McComb.

North American, 20:886-894. Can Man Abolish War? by H. Begbie.

Outlook, 107:767. First Conference of Church Peace Workers.

Outlook, 105:916-932. Peace of Righteousness, by T. Roosevelt.

Outlook, 110:649-650. Challenge of Christianity.

Outlook, 108:810-811. Why not Try Christianity?

Outlook, 111:305-307. Courage of Christ.

Outlook, 111:596-597. Did Jesus Christ Teach Non-resistance? by Lyman Abbott.

Outlook, 117:92. Some Commonplaces of Christianity, by Lyman Abbott.

Review of Reviews, 50:488-489. World Struggle against War.

Review of Reviews, 51:736-737. How to Unify the Peace Movement, by F. H. Stead.

Review of Reviews, 51:237-238. International League of Peace.

Review of Reviews, 51:33-34. Democracy and Peace, by E. Root.

Survey, 33:393-394. Melting Pot and the Fires of War, by E. A. Filene.

Survey, 33:604-607. Psychological Bases of Internationalism, by G. H. Mead.

Survey, 36:281-282. Bill of Rights for the World.

Survey, 35:649. International Peace, by S. W. Fernberger.

Survey, 37:363-364. War and Peace, by C. Eastman.

Unpopular Review, 6:269-275. Peace by Force.

World's Work, 34:18-19. Militarism and Democracy.

World's Work, 33:233. American Movement for Peace.

Yale Review, 7:24-42. Way to Durable Peace, by B. Lasker.

OTHER REFERENCES:

Annual Reports of Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, for 1914, 1915, 1916. Lake Mohonk Conference, Mohonk, New York.

Lecture on the aim in teaching history, by Professor Ralph Carter. (Course in educational psychology.)

Lecture on The League to Enforce Peace, by William Howard Taft. December 17, 1916, at the University of Kansas.

Pamphlet: A League of Nations. World Peace Foundation, Boston, October, 1917.

Pamphlet: School Books and International Prejudices, by Albert Bushnell Hart. American Association for International Conciliation, New York, 1911.

Pamphlet: The Foundations of a League of Peace, by G. Lowes Dickinson. World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1915.

Pamphlet: The Basis of Durable Peace, by Cosmos. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1917.

Perusal daily of the diplomacy of the war as recorded in the Kansas City Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the New York Times.

PHOTOMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER
~
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

HN31 .H36 1918
The Christian nations and the Hague,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 2827